

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DWIGHT A. CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-10394  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CLINTON VAZQUEZ, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S**  
**PENDING MOTIONS (ECF Nos. 11, 12, 13)**

On February 16, 2024, Plaintiff Dwight A. Campbell, appearing *pro se*, filed this action against Defendants Clinton Vazquez, the Logan Township Police Department, and the United States Marshal Service. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) At the time he filed his Complaint, Campbell did not pay the required filing fee. Nor did he file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Instead, Campbell filed what he called a “Statement of Filing Fee” in which he said that he was previously granted *in forma pauperis* status in an unrelated 2022 state court case. (*See* Statement, ECF No. 2.)

On April 16, 2024, the Court issued an order (1) construing Campbell’s “Statement of Filing Fee” as a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (2) denying that request, and (3) dismissing Campbell’s Complaint without prejudice. (*See* Order,

ECF No. 6.) The Court dismissed Campbell's Complaint for two reasons. First, he had not paid the filing fee or provided the Court any basis to conclude that he was indigent and was unable to pay the fee. Second, documents that the Court had sent to Campbell had returned to the Court as undeliverable, and the Court therefore dismissed his Complaint for failure to comply the Court's local rule to update his address. *See* E.D. Mich. Local Rule 11.2.

Now pending before the Court are three motions Campbell has filed: (1) a motion to serve the Defendants with the Complaint and to update his address (*see* Mot., ECF No. 11), (2) a second motion to serve the Defendants (*see* Mot., ECF No. 12), and (3) a motion for a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction (*see* Mot., ECF No. 13).

The Court **STRIKES** all three motions from the record. As of April 16, 2024, Campbell's Complaint was dismissed and this case was closed. Even if Campbell has now complied with Local Rule 11.2 by providing the Court an updated, valid address, he still has not paid the required filing fee and/or completed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action. And his case cannot move forward until he does so.

Accordingly, if Campbell wishes to proceed in this action he shall (1) pay the required filing fee or file a completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and (2) file a motion to re-open these proceedings and set aside the Court's dismissal

order. The Court will not consider any other filings by Campbell in this case until he complies with those requirements.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: August 27, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on August 27, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126